

3rd February 1925]

(c) whether the Government are aware that a mahazar was submitted by the members of the depressed classes on 27th November 1924 to the District Collector, Salem, praying not to give effect to the resolution of the Salem Municipal Council with reference to eviction of the depressed classes from their present locality;

(d) whether there are not several vacant sites within the municipal area to fulfil the object of opening a park;

(e) whether the present Chairman of the Municipal Council, Salem, has got a plot of ground very near to the locality of the depressed classes at Mulluvadi;

(f) whether the proposal to acquire the houses of the depressed classes was made by the Chairman or by any of the municipal councillors; and

(g) if the Government have no information with reference to clauses (a) to (f), whether they will be pleased to call for the information?

A.—(a) to (f) The Government have no information. A report has been called for.

Mr. R. VEERIAN:—“ May I know, with reference to clause (g), whether the report said to have been called for has already been received; if so, whether the same will be placed on the table of this House ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—“ The report has not yet been received.”

Sinking of a well for the depressed classes in Ellipalli village.

* 20 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) with reference to the answer to the supplementary question to clause (b) of question No. 605 put at the meeting of the 10th October 1924 regarding the sinking of a well for the depressed classes in Ellipalli village, whether the Government have already inquired into the matter; and

(b) if so, whether they will be pleased to lay a copy of the result of their inquiry on the Council table?

A.—(a) & (b) The resolution of the Legislative Council referred to in the supplementary question was communicated to all local bodies for information and guidance in G.O. No. 2660, L. & M., dated 25th September 1924. No further action was considered necessary.

Mr. R. VEERIAN:—“ May I know whether the Government are aware that the Government Order has simply been recorded without any effect being given to it? Also I want to know whether the Government will be pleased to make inquiries as to how many local bodies have already given effect to the Government Order and how many did not give effect to it.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—“ It is a matter for the consideration of the local bodies.”

Medical.

Fees levied on out-patients for treatment in hospitals.

* 21 Q.—Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether G.O. Mis. No. 1454, P.H., of 1st November 1921 is still in force;

[3rd February 1925]

(b) whether, under the said Government Order, all out-patients whose incomes are not below Rs. 30 a month are required to pay two annas for medicines on each occasion they attend the hospital including each of the occasions on which the patient attends for repeating the medicine;

(c) whether the two annas is merely the admission fee or cost of medicine; and

(d) whether, in view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, it is contemplated to reconsider the matter and issue a revised circular?

A.—(a) & (b) The answer is in the affirmative.

(c) The amount collected represents payment for medicines supplied.

Medical advice is free to all out-patients.

(d) The question is under the consideration of the Government.

Education.

Law College Reorganization Committee's report.

*22 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why the Government passed orders on the Law College Reorganization Committee's report without reference to the Board of Studies in Law, the Faculty of Law, the Syndicate, the Academic Council, or the Senate, or the High Court, or the Vakils' Association;

(b) the reasons why this new system is to be brought into force in the middle of an academic year;

(c) whether the Government accept the recommendation of the Committee with regard to the tenure and continuance of the Assistant Lecturers and if not, why not;

(d) the reasons why juniors of more than six years' standing at the Bar are excluded from the field of selection for the assistant lecturerships;

(e) the appointing authority in regard to all these appointments; and

(f) the exact powers of the College Council over the affairs of the college?

A.—(a) The hon. Member's attention is invited to the answer to clause (f) of question No. 1452, asked at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 6th December 1924.

(b) The Government consider that it would be in the interests of the college to give effect to the revised arrangements as early as practicable.

(c) It is not clear what the specific recommendations are which are referred to. Assistant Lecturers will be appointed for three years and the question of the renewal of the term in each case will be considered on the merits.

(d) The policy is to appoint as Assistant Lecturers junior practitioners who can give sufficient time and attention to the work of the college.

(e) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to the supplementary question asked by him at the last meeting of the Council.

(f) The hon. Member's attention is invited to paragraph 7 of G.O. No. 1702, Law (Education), dated 5th November 1924.